Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 000–000 (0000) Printed 14 January 2016 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

Spin Properties of Supermassive Black Holes with Powerful Outflows

Ruth. A. Daly⋆
Penn State University, Berks Campus, Reading, PA 19608, USA

arXiv:1601.03327v1 [astro-ph.GA] 13 Jan 2016

14 January 2016

ABSTRACT

Relationships between beam power and accretion disk luminosity are studied for a sample of 55 HERG, 13 LERG, and 29 RLQ with powerful outflows. The ratio of beam power to disk luminosity tends to be high for LERG, low for RLQ, and spans the full range of values for HERG. Writing general expressions for the disk luminosity and beam power and applying the empirically determined relationships allows a function that parameterizes the spins of the holes to be estimated. Interestingly, one of the solutions that is consistent with the data has a functional form that is remarkably similar to that expected in the generalized Blandford-Znajek model with a magnetic field that is similar in form to that expected in MAD and ADAF models. Values of the spin function, obtained independent of specific outflow models, suggest that spin and AGN type are not related for these types of sources. The spin function can be used to solve for black hole spin in the context of particular outflow models, and one example is provided.

Key words: black hole physics – galaxies: active

1 INTRODUCTION

A significant amount of theoretical work has shown that the spin of a supermassive black hole is likely to impact the properties of powerful collimated outflows from supermassive black hole systems. For example, the work of Blandford & Znajek (1977), Thorne et al. (1986), Blandford (1990), and Meier (1999) and the more recent work of McKinney & Gammie (2004), McKinney (2005, 2006), Hawley & Krolik (2006), Tchekhovskoy et al. (2010), Tchekhovskoy et al. (2011), Yuan & Narayan (2014), and Sadowski et al. (2015) to name a few, indicate that the spin of the hole may play a significant role in the beam power of outflows from black hole systems.

Empirical studies of AGN with measured X-ray iron lines indicate that some of the sources have significant spin, as summarized in the recent review of Reynolds (2014); selection effects may explain this as an observational bias (Reynolds 2015). Studies of AGN with outflows analyzed in the context of particular models suggest that these sources have a broad range of spin values (e.g. Daly 2009, 2011; Gnedin et al. 2012; Mikhailov et al. 2015).

Spin values are likely to indicate whether the accretion history of the source under study was chaotic, leading to a low spin value (King & Pringle 2006, 2007; King et al. 2008), or more smoothly progressing, leading to a high spin value (Volonteri et al. 2005; Volonteri et al. 2007; and Dubois et al. 2014). Thus, studies of spins may indicate whether a chaotic or non-chaotic accretion history was likely to have been dominant for that class of source.

The purpose of the work presented here is to study sources with powerful outflows to determine if the outflow and accretion disk properties of the systems provide indications of the spin characteristics of the sources. The sample of sources studied is described in section 2, the analysis and results are presented in section 3, and a discussion of the results and implications follows in section 4.

2 THE SOURCES

To study the relationship between beam power and accretion disk luminosity, a sample of sources for which these quantities are known was selected. Beam powers, or energy per unit time carried by the outflow, can be determined from multi-frequency radio maps of extended powerful FRII (Fanaroff & Riley 1974) (classical double) radio galaxies and radio loud quasars, as described by O'Dea et al. (2009) and summarized by Daly (2011). The beam powers for these sources are not affected by Doppler beaming and boosting due to bulk motion; the sources are large, typically much larger than the host galaxy, and the radio emission is emitted isotropically. Beam powers are obtained by applying the equations of strong shock physics using parameters empirically deter-

⋆ E-mail: rdaly@psu.edu



Figure 1. The Log of the ratio of beam power to accretion disk luminosity is shown versus the Log of the ratio of accretion disk luminosity to Eddington luminosity for 55 HERG (solid circles), 13 LERG (open circles), and 29 RLQ (open stars). The best fit lines in (slope, y-intercept) pairs are: $(-0.61 \pm 0.07, -1.20 \pm 0.08)$ (HERG - solid line); $(-0.53 \pm 0.15, -1.08 \pm 0.29)$ (LERG - dashed line); $(-0.41 \pm 0.15, -1.05 \pm 0.10)$ (RLQ - dotted line); and $(-0.56 \pm 0.05, -1.14 \pm 0.06)$ (all sources). All fits are unweighted and the same symbols are used in all figures.

mined from the multi-frequency radio maps. One parameter is the source age, which is determined with a spectral aging analysis. A significant amount of work has shown that these ages provide reasonable estimates for very powerful FRII sources like those included here, and uncertainties in the spectral aging analysis are included in uncertainties of parameters determined using the analysis, as summarized by O'Dea et al. (2009) and references therein, though there may be some caveats as discussed, for example, by Eilek et al. (1997), Blundell & Rawlings (2000), and Hardcastle (2013).

Thus, the parent population begins with classical double radio sources with beam powers that have been determined. Sources with beam powers obtained by O'Dea et al. (2009) and Daly et al. (2012) are included. Of these sources, those with a reliable estimate of accretion disk luminosity were identified; the [OIII] luminosity of the source was used to determine the bolometric luminosity of the accretion disk using the well-known relation $L_{bol} = 3500 L_{OIII}$ (e.g. Heckman et al. 2004; Dicken et al. 2014). Using the tables published by Grimes, Rawlings, & Willott (2004), this led to a sample of 55 high excitation radio galaxies (HERG), 13 low excitation radio galaxies (LERG), and 29 radio loud quasars (RLQ). The sources types are from Laing, Riley, & Longair (1983), and the black hole masses are from McLure et al. (2004) and McLure et al. (2006).

3 ANALYSIS

The ratio of the beam power to the accretion disk luminosity is a fundamental physical variable that parameterizes the strength of the outflow relative to the accretion disk. This ratio is shown in Fig. 1 as a function of the accretion disk luminosity normalized by the Eddington luminosity, $L_{Edd} \simeq 1.3 \times 10^{46} M_8$ erg s^{-1} where M_8 is the black hole mass in units of $10^8 M_\odot$. There is an obvious trend between these two quantities, and the best fit parameters are listed in the figure caption. To test whether this is a spurious result due to the Malmquist bias (e.g. Feigelson & Berg 1983) a partial correlation analysis was carried out using the code of Akritas & Siebert (1996). Following Hardcastle et al. (2009) and Mingo et al. (2014), redshift is used as a proxy for distance and a ratio of partial Kendall's τ to the square root of the variance σ of $\tau/\sigma > 3$ indicates a significant correlation between $\mathrm{Log(L_j/L_{bol})}$ and $\mathrm{Log(L_{bol}/L_{Edd})}$ in the presence of Log(1 + z). The ratio of τ/σ is 12.6 for all sources; 10.5 for HERG; 1.9 for LERG; and 3.2 for RLQ. This indicates the fits obtained are valid with the possible exception of that obtained for LERG sources.

These fits suggest that

$$\frac{L_j}{L_{bol}} \propto \left(\frac{L_{bol}}{L_{Edd}}\right)^{\alpha_*} \quad (1)$$

with $\alpha_* = -0.5$ provides a good description of the data, with the possible exception of the LERG data. The impact of using $\alpha_* = -0.56 \pm 0.05$ is discussed below.

It is convenient to parameterize the accretion disk luminosity as $L_{bol} \propto \epsilon \dot{M} \propto \epsilon \dot{m} M$, where M is the black hole mass, $\dot{M}$ is the mass accretion rate, $\dot{m} \equiv \dot{M}/\dot{M}_{Edd}$ is the dimensionless mass accretion rate, $\dot{M}_{Edd} \equiv L_{Edd} c^{-2}$ is the Eddington accretion rate, and ϵ is a dimensionless efficiency factor. It is convenient to parameterize the beam power as $L_j \propto \dot{m}^a M^b f(j)$, where $f(j)$ is a function of the spin of the black hole. To determine the values of a and b, empirical relationships are considered. Eq. (1) with $\alpha_* = -0.5$ indicates that $\dot{m}^a M^b f(j) \propto (\epsilon \dot{m})^{1/2} M$, which suggests that $b = 1$. In this case, the ratio of L_j/L_{bol} is expected to be independent of black hole mass. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the data are consistent with the ratio being independent of mass, so we adopt a value of $b = 1$. Thus, $\dot{m}^a M f(j) \propto (\epsilon \dot{m})^{1/2} M$, which indicates that $\dot{m}^a \propto (\epsilon \dot{m})^{1/2}$. The two simplest solutions to this equation are $a = 1$ with $\epsilon \propto \dot{m}$ and $a = 1/2$ with $\epsilon =$ constant. The first solution yields $L_j \propto \dot{m} M f(j)$ with $L_{bol} \propto \dot{m}^2 M$. The second solution yields $L_j \propto \dot{m}^{1/2} M f(j)$ with $L_{bol} \propto \dot{m} M$. It is interesting to note that the expression for L_j indicated by the first solution is very similar to that expected in some models of jet production, as discussed in section 4.

The general equations for L_{bol} and L_j can be combined to solve for the function $f(j)$. To do this requires that constants of proportionality be obtained for L_{bol} and L_j. This may be done by parameterizing the maximum possible emission in terms of the Eddington luminosity, so the maximum possible value of L_{bol} is $L_{bol}(max) = g_{bol} L_{Edd}$ and that for L_j is $L_j(max) = g_j L_{Edd}$. Assuming the maximum values are reached when $\dot{m} = 1$ and $\epsilon = 1$, and absorbing all constants of proportionality into the coefficients yields

$$L_{bol,44} \simeq 130\ g_{bol}\ (\epsilon \dot{m}) M_8 \quad (2)$$

$$L_{j,44} \simeq 130\ g_j\ \dot{m}^a M_8 f(j)/f_{max}. \quad (3)$$



Figure 2. The Log of the ratio of beam power to accretion disk luminosity is shown versus the Log of black hole mass. There is no correlation between these quantities. The slopes of the best fit lines are: -0.07 ± 0.24 (HERG); -0.40 ± 0.51 (LERG); 0.26 ± 0.17 (RLQ); and -0.17 ± 0.14 (all sources).



Figure 3. The Log of the square root of the spin function is shown versus Log of (1+z); this is expected to be a reasonable first order approximation of spin. The values shown here are obtained using eq. (4) with $g_{bol} = 1$ and $g_j = 1$.

Here $L_{bol,44}$ and $L_{j,44}$ are in units of 10^{44} erg s^{-1} and f_{max} is the maximum possible value of the function $f(j)$, which is typically obtained when the dimensionless spin $j = 1$; here j (sometimes denoted a or a_*) is defined in the usual way, $j \equiv Jc/(GM^2)$, where J is the spin angular momentum of the hole. Combining eqs. (2) and (3), and using the relationship $\dot{m}^a = (\epsilon\dot{m})^{1/2}$ indicated above, we obtain

$$\frac{f(j)}{f_{max}} \simeq \left(\frac{L_{j,44}}{g_j}\right) \left(\frac{g_{bol}}{130 L_{bol,44} M_8}\right)^{1/2} , \quad (4)$$

independent of the value of a, and thus independent of specific outflow models.

If this analysis is carried out for the specific value of α_* obtained for all sources, $\alpha_* = -0.56 \pm 0.05$, then eq. (4) becomes

$$\frac{f(j)}{f_{max}} \simeq \left(\frac{L_{j,44}}{g_j}\right) \left(\frac{g_{bol}}{L_{bol,44}}\right)^{0.44\pm0.05} (130 M_8)^{-0.56\pm0.05} , \quad (5)$$

which is also independent of a, and is very similar to eq. (4).

Empirical results for $\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}}$ obtained using eq. (4) with $g_{bol} = 1$ and $g_j = 1$ are shown in Fig. 3 and listed in Table 1. The square root of the function is shown because in many models this is a good first order approximation to the spin of the hole. Estimates of black hole spins can be obtained from $\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}}$ in the context of specific models.

Changing the normalizations g_{bol} and g_j will cause the values of $f(j)/f_{max}$ to shift. However, only small upward shifts are allowed by the data. This follows because, empirically (e.g. see Fig. 4), g_{bol} must be close to one, and certainly can not be much less than one, and $f(j) \propto g_{bol}^{1/2}$. And, as the value of g_j decreases, $f(j)/f_{max}$ increases. Requiring that the largest values of $f(j)/f_{max}$ remain less than or equal to one indicates that g_j should be greater than about 0.4, consistent with the empirical results illustrated in Fig. 4. Thus, the true value of $f(j)/f_{max}$ is only allowed to float between the value obtained here, and the current value divided by about 0.4.

If a particular outflow model is specified, the value of j may be obtained. For example, in one representation of the generalized Blandford-Znajek (BZ) model $\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}} = j(1 + \sqrt{1 - j^2})^{-1}$ (e.g. Blandford & Znajek 1977; Tchekhovskoy et al. 2010; Yuan & Narayan 2014). Values of j obtained in this model are shown Fig. 5 for $g_{bol} = 1$ and $g_j = 1$.

4 DISCUSSION

There is a clear separation of sources in terms of the ratio of beam power to disk luminosity (see Fig. 1). LERG sources tend to have the highest ratio of beam power to disk luminosity, with some sources having a beam power comparable to or even larger than the disk luminosity. RLQ tend to have a low ratio, with most sources having a beam power less than about 10 % the disk luminosity. HERG tend to span the full range of values of this ratio. The relationship between this ratio and the Eddington normalized disk luminosity is statistically significant after accounting for the dependence of these quantities on redshift for the HERG, RLQ, all sources combined, but not for the LERG sources.

Solutions that are consistent with the data may be compared with theoretical expectations. In the generalized BZ model, the equation for beam power is $L_j = \kappa_j B^2 M^2 f(j)$ (e.g. Blandford & Znajek 1977; Blandford 1990; Tchekhovskoy et al. 2010). For ADAF and MAD accretion disks, the magnetic field strength depends on multiple parameters including $\dot{m}$ and M; the dependence of the field on these parameters is $B^2 \propto (\dot{m}/M)$ (e.g. Yuan & Narayan 2014) or $B_4^2 = g_B^2(\dot{m}/M_8)$, indicating that $L_j \propto \dot{m}\ M\ f(j)$;



Figure 4. The Log of the beam power (in Eddington units) is shown versus the Log of the accretion disk luminosity (in Eddington units) so that the range of values can be seen.



Figure 5. The Log of the black hole spin, obtained in the context of the generalized BZ model, is shown versus the Log of (1+z).

B_4 is the field strength in units of 10^4 G. Interestingly, this theoretical equation for the beam power is identical to the empirical relation indicated by the first solution discussed in section 3. Thus, the generalized BZ model with an ADAF or MAD accretion disk is consistent with the empirically motivated relationships between the beam power, disk luminosity, and Eddington luminosity discussed in section 3, perhaps suggesting that this is in fact the correct model, or close to the correct model. In this context, the first solution along with the normalization given by equation (3) allows a determination of the coefficient g_B that describes the field strength. Obtaining the normalization κ_j from Tchekhovskoy et al. (2011), which is nearly identical to that obtained by Daly (2009) with j^2 replaced by $f(j)$, we obtain $g_B \simeq 20\sqrt{g_j}$. This is similar to the value expected in the MAD model of about $g_B \simeq 30$ (e.g. Yuan & Narayan 2014) accounting for their different definition of $\dot{M}_{EDD}$. Note that to be consistent with this representation of L_j, we require $L_{bol} \propto \dot{m}^2 M_8$. Theoretical representations of L_j and L_{bol} should be consistent with the empirical relation indicated by eq. (1).

The spin function $f(j)/f_{max}$ may be obtained independent of specific outflow models; this quantity is expected to provide a good first order estimate of black hole spin. A broad range of values of $\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}}$ is obtained (see Fig. 3). The values and range of values of $\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}}$ are similar for all three types of sources studied; sources do not separate out according to this quantity. This suggests that spin is not related to AGN type for FRII HERG and RLQ, and possibly also for LERG.

Finally, even though $\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}}$ depends upon the values of g_{bol} and g_j, it is argued in section 3 that only small upward shifts of this quantity are allowed by the data. At this point, the data are not sufficient to be able to distinguish between chaotic accretion and non-chaotic accretion for the sources studied; both are consistent with the results obtained here. Further studies of this type with larger numbers of sources may be able to distinguish between these accretion scenarios.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank the organizers of conference "The Physics of Supermassive Black Hole Formation and Feedback" where this work was presented; Sasha Tchekovskoy and Johnathan McKinney for interesting and helpful discussions; and the referee for helpful comments and suggestions. This work was supported in part by Penn State University.

REFERENCES

Akritas, M. G., & Siebert, J. 1996, MNRAS, 278, 919
Blandford, R. D. 1990, in Active Galactic Nuclei, ed. T. J. L. Courvoisier & M. Mayor (Berlin: Springer), 161
Blandford, R. D., & Znajek, R. L. 1977, MNRAS, 179, 433
Blundell, K. M., & Rawlings, S. 2000, AJ, 119, 1111
Daly, R. A. 2009, ApJL, 696, L32
Daly, R. A. 2011, MNRAS, 414, 1253
Daly, R. A., Sprinkle, T. B., O'Dea, C. P., Kharb, P., & Baum, S. A. 2012, MNRAS, 423, 2498
Dicken, D., Tadhunter, C., Morganti, R., Axon, D., Robinson, A., Magagnoli, M., Kharb, P., Ramos Almeida C., Mingo, B., Hardcastle, M., Nesvadba, N. P. H., Singh, V., Kouwenhoven, M. B. N., Rose, M., Spoon, H., Inskip, K. J., & Holt, J. 2014, ApJ, 788, 98
Dubois, Y., Volonteri, M., & Silk, J. 2014, MNRAS, 440, 1590
Eilek, J. A, Melrose, D. B., & Walker, M. A. 1997, ApJ, 483, 282
Fanaroff, B. L., & Riley, J. M. 1974, MNRAS, 164, 31
Feigelson, E. D., & Berg, C. J. 1983, ApJ, 269, 400
Gnedin, Yu. N., Afanasiev, V. L., Borisov, N. V., Piotrovich, M. Yu., Natsvlishvili, T. M., & Buliga, S. D. 2012, ARep, 56, 573
Grimes, J. A., Rawlings, S., & Willott, C. J. 2004, MNRAS, 349, 503

Table 1. Black Hole Spin Function of FRII Sources

Source	type	z	$\mathrm{Log}(\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}})$	Source	type	z	$\mathrm{Log}(\sqrt{f(j)/f_{max}})$
3C 33	HERG	0.059	-0.88 ± 0.16	3C 322	HERG	1.681	-0.18 ± 0.12
3C 192	HERG	0.059	-0.91 ± 0.19	3C 239	HERG	1.781	-0.31 ± 0.13
3C 285	HERG	0.079	-0.73 ± 0.19	3C 294	HERG	1.786	-0.45 ± 0.12
3C 452	HERG	0.081	-0.67 ± 0.14	3C 225B	HERG	0.582	-0.45 ± 0.08
3C 388	HERG	0.090	-0.56 ± 0.16	3C 55	HERG	0.735	-0.23 ± 0.10
3C 321	HERG	0.096	-1.06 ± 0.17	3C 68.2	HERG	1.575	-0.53 ± 0.12
3C 433	HERG	0.101	-0.46 ± 0.13	3C 35	LERG	0.067	-0.66 ± 0.20
3C 20	HERG	0.174	-0.31 ± 0.11	3C 326	LERG	0.088	-0.52 ± 0.16
3C 28	HERG	0.195	-0.69 ± 0.12	3C 236	LERG	0.099	-0.62 ± 0.17
3C 349	HERG	0.205	-0.53 ± 0.13	4C 12.03	LERG	0.156	-0.61 ± 0.15
3C 436	HERG	0.214	-0.56 ± 0.12	3C 319	LERG	0.192	-0.34 ± 0.13
3C 171	HERG	0.238	-0.68 ± 0.11	3C 132	LERG	0.214	-0.63 ± 0.13
3C 284	HERG	0.239	-0.77 ± 0.12	3C 123	LERG	0.218	-0.14 ± 0.07
3C 300	HERG	0.270	-0.55 ± 0.11	3C 153	LERG	0.277	-0.67 ± 0.11
3C 438	HERG	0.290	-0.32 ± 0.09	4C 14.27	LERG	0.392	-0.43 ± 0.10
3C 299	HERG	0.367	-0.68 ± 0.10	3C 200	LERG	0.458	-0.56 ± 0.09
3C 42	HERG	0.395	-0.50 ± 0.10	3C 295	LERG	0.461	-0.21 ± 0.08
3C 16	HERG	0.405	-0.40 ± 0.10	3C 19	LERG	0.482	-0.60 ± 0.09
3C 274.1	HERG	0.422	-0.24 ± 0.09	3C 427.1	LERG	0.572	-0.72 ± 0.09
3C 244.1	HERG	0.428	-0.85 ± 0.09	3C 249.1	RLQ	0.311	-1.04 ± 0.13
3C 457	HERG	0.428	-0.51 ± 0.09	3C 351	RLQ	0.371	-0.84 ± 0.12
3C 46	HERG	0.437	-0.72 ± 0.10	3C 215	RLQ	0.411	-0.45 ± 0.12
3C 341	HERG	0.448	-0.67 ± 0.10	3C 47	RLQ	0.425	-0.69 ± 0.11
3C 172	HERG	0.519	-0.66 ± 0.09	3C 334	RLQ	0.555	-0.78 ± 0.11
3C 330	HERG	0.549	-0.63 ± 0.09	3C 275.1	RLQ	0.557	-0.76 ± 0.12
3C 49	HERG	0.621	-0.58 ± 0.09	3C 263	RLQ	0.646	-0.70 ± 0.11
3C 337	HERG	0.635	-0.44 ± 0.09	3C 207	RLQ	0.684	-0.38 ± 0.11
3C 34	HERG	0.690	-0.83 ± 0.08	3C 254	RLQ	0.734	-0.77 ± 0.12
3C 441	HERG	0.708	-0.49 ± 0.09	3C 175	RLQ	0.768	-0.61 ± 0.11
3C 247	HERG	0.749	-0.84 ± 0.10	3C 196	RLQ	0.871	-0.28 ± 0.11
3C 277.2	HERG	0.766	-0.61 ± 0.08	3C 309.1	RLQ	0.904	-0.52 ± 0.10
3C 340	HERG	0.775	-0.51 ± 0.09	3C 336	RLQ	0.927	-0.57 ± 0.10
3C 352	HERG	0.806	-0.67 ± 0.09	3C 245	RLQ	1.029	-0.54 ± 0.10
3C 263.1	HERG	0.824	-0.50 ± 0.09	3C 212	RLQ	1.049	-0.45 ± 0.11
3C 217	HERG	0.897	-0.44 ± 0.09	3C 186	RLQ	1.063	-0.59 ± 0.11
3C 175.1	HERG	0.920	-0.40 ± 0.09	3C 208	RLQ	1.110	-0.45 ± 0.11
3C 289	HERG	0.967	-0.42 ± 0.10	3C 204	RLQ	1.112	-0.48 ± 0.10
3C 280	HERG	0.996	-0.94 ± 0.10	3C 190	RLQ	1.197	-0.32 ± 0.11
3C 356	HERG	1.079	-0.39 ± 0.11	3C 68.1	RLQ	1.238	-0.41 ± 0.11
3C 252	HERG	1.103	-0.53 ± 0.09	4C 16.49	RLQ	1.296	-0.52 ± 0.11
3C 368	HERG	1.132	-0.50 ± 0.10	3C 181	RLQ	1.382	-0.65 ± 0.11
3C 267	HERG	1.140	-0.47 ± 0.11	3C 268.4	RLQ	1.400	-0.47 ± 0.15
3C 324	HERG	1.206	-0.60 ± 0.12	3C 14	RLQ	1.469	-0.54 ± 0.11
3C 266	HERG	1.275	-0.58 ± 0.10	3C 270.1	RLQ	1.519	-0.09 ± 0.11
3C 13	HERG	1.351	-0.53 ± 0.10	3C 205	RLQ	1.534	-0.55 ± 0.11
4C 13.66	HERG	1.450	-0.42 ± 0.10	3C 432	RLQ	1.805	-0.54 ± 0.11
3C 437	HERG	1.480	-0.17 ± 0.11	3C 191	RLQ	1.956	-0.50 ± 0.12
3C 241	HERG	1.617	-0.46 ± 0.11	3C 9	RLQ	2.012	-0.34 ± 0.13
3C 470	HERG	1.653	-0.27 ± 0.11				

Hardcastle, M. J. 2013, MNRAS, 433, 336

Hardcastle, M. J., Evans, D. A., & Croston, J. H. 2009, MNRAS, 396, 1929

Hawley, J. F., & Krolik, J. H. 2006, ApJ, 641, 103

Heckman, T. M., Kauffmann, G., Brinchmann, J., Charlot, S., Tremonti, C., & White, S. D. M. 2004, ApJ, 613, 109

King, A. R., & Pringle, J. E. 2006, MNRAS, 373, L90

King, A. R., & Pringle, J. E. 2007, MNRAS, 377, L25

King, A. R., Pringle, J. E., & Hofmann, J. A. 2008, MNRAS, 385, 1621

Laing, R. A., Riley, J. M., & Longair, M. S. 1983, MNRAS, 204, 151

McKinney, J. C. 2005, ApJ, 630, L5

McKinney, J. C. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 1561

McKinney, J. C., & Gammie, C. F. 2004, ApJ, 611, 977

McLure, R. J., Jarvis, M. J., Targett, T. A., Dunlop, J. S., & Best, P. N. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 1395

McLure, R. J., Willott, C. J., Jarvis, M. J., Rawlings, S., Hill, G. J., Mitchell, E., Dunlop, J. S., & Wold, M. 2004, MNRAS, 351, 347

Meier, D. L. 1999, ApJ, 522, 753

Mikhailov, A. G., Gnedin, Y. N., & Belonovsky, A. V. 2015, ApJ, 58, 157

Mingo, B., Hardcastle, M. J., Croston, J. H., Dicken, D., Evans, D. A., Morganti, R., & Tadhunter, C. 2014, MNRAS, 440, 269

O'Dea, C. P., Daly, R. A., Kharb, P., Freeman, K. A., & Baum, S. 2009, A&A, 494, 471

Reynolds, C. S. 2014, Space Sci. Rev., 183, 277

Reynolds, C. S. 2015, arXiv:1510.07638

Tchekhovskoy, A., Narayan, R., McKinney, J. C. 2010, ApJ, 711, 50

Tchekhovskoy, A., Narayan, R., McKinney, J. C. 2011, MNRAS, 418, L79

Thorne, K. S., Price, R. H., MacDonald, D. A. 1986, Black Holes: The Membrane Paradigm, New Haven, CT, Yale Univ. Press

Sadowski, A., Narayan, R., Tchekhovskoy, A., Abarca, D., Zhu, Y., & McKinney, J. C. 2015, MNRAS, 447, 49

Volonteri, M., Madau, P., Quataert, E., & Rees, M. J. 2005, ApJ, 620, 69

Volonteri, M., Sikora, M., & Lasota, J.P. 2007, ApJ, 667, 704

Yuan, F., & Narayan, R. 2014, ARA&A, 52, 529